Submitted to *INFORMS Journal on Computing*
manuscript (Please, provide the mansucript number!)

Authors are encouraged to submit new papers to INFORMS journals by means of a style file template, which includes the journal title. However, use of a template does not certify that the paper has been accepted for publication in the named journal. INFORMS journal templates are for the exclusive purpose of submitting to an INFORMS journal and should not be used to distribute the papers in print or online or to submit the papers to another publication.

arXiv:1703.04185v1 [stat.OT] 12 Mar 2017

Estimating the Probability that a Function Observed with Noise is Convex

Nanjing Jian, Shane G. Henderson
School of Operations Research and Information Engineering, Cornell University
nj227@cornell.edu, sgh9@cornell.edu

Consider a real-valued function that can only be observed with stochastic simulation noise at a finite set of design points within a Euclidean space. We wish to determine whether there exists a convex function that goes through the true function values at the design points. We develop an asymptotically consistent Bayesian sequential sampling procedure that estimates the posterior probability of this being true. In each iteration, the posterior probability is estimated using Monte Carlo simulation. We offer three variance reduction methods – change of measure, acceptance-rejection, and conditional Monte Carlo. Numerical experiments suggest that the conditional Monte Carlo method should be preferred.

Key words: convexity detection; Bayesian sequential models; variance reduction; likelihood ratio; conditional Monte Carlo

1. Introduction

Our goal in this paper is to develop a method to determine whether a real-valued function $g : S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, observed at a finite set of points $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_r$ in S with noise from a stochastic simulation model, is convex in the sense that a convex function f exists that coincides with g at $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_r$. That is, does there exist a convex function f that goes through the points $(\boldsymbol{x}_1, g(\boldsymbol{x}_1)), (\boldsymbol{x}_2, g(\boldsymbol{x}_2)), \ldots, (\boldsymbol{x}_r, g(\boldsymbol{x}_r))$? For example, g could be the expected profit in an inventory problem where the demand ξ is random, the starting inventory $\boldsymbol{x}$ of the day can take integer values $S = \{0, 1, \ldots, \infty\}$, and we only observe a simulation estimate of g at $\boldsymbol{x}$. We might choose a few integer values in S to test whether the expected profit is convex as a function of the starting inventory. Or g might represent the (true) expected waiting time for an ambulance as a function of base locations represented in latitude-longitude coordinates, where we observe g with noise through a stochastic

simulation model of ambulance operations. We might then choose a finite set of base-location options in the city to test whether the waiting time is convex with regard to the location of the ambulance bases.

Convexity is a key structural property that can be exploited in many ways. One can use gradient-based methods (for smooth functions) or a cutting-plane based method (for nonsmooth functions) to quickly find the optimum, or bounds on the optimum, e.g., Nesterov (2004), Glynn and Infanger (2013). Even if a function is not globally convex, one might use our test to identify regions around local minima in which the restriction of the objective function is convex ("basins of attraction"). Such basins can provide information on the stability of a solution (Vogel 1988). Beyond optimization, convexity can also provide insights into qualitative model behavior in simulation applications and elsewhere. This is especially useful when we have a sequence of similar simulation models with different inputs but the same structural property.

Most studies on convexity detection use a frequentist hypothesis-testing framework, and can be categorized with regard to how the null hypothesis is defined. The first category uses an infinite-dimensional functional approach. It defines the null hypothesis as $g \in \mathcal{C}$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is the cone of convex functions in an appropriate function space, whereas the alternative hypothesis is $g \notin \mathcal{C}$. The representative paper Juditsky and Nemirovski (2002) models g as a Gaussian process assuming smoothness under the null hypothesis, and uses the L^r distance between g and $\mathcal{C}$ as the test statistic.

The second category, which is closer to our paper, works with finite-dimensional vectors. The null hypothesis is $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{C}$, where $\boldsymbol{g}$ is the restriction of g to a finite set of points, and $\mathbb{C}$ is the set of convex functions restricted to the same set of points. In this case, the noisy evaluations of $\boldsymbol{g}$ are modeled by a Gaussian random vector. Silvapulle and Sen (2001) use the distance between this Gaussian vector and $\mathbb{C}$ as the test statistic, and show that this distance follows a chi-bar-square distribution, the parameters of which can be evaluated using simulation.

The third category fits a regression model with Gaussian noise on the observations of g and tests the hypothesis of convexity through the estimated model parameters. This approach is essentially testing whether there exists a convex function that could have generated the observed finite set of function values. In one dimension and under regularity conditions, Baraud et al. (2005) show that testing for the regression parameter is equivalent

to testing $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{C}$, when $\mathbb{C}$ is defined with regard to nonnegative second order Vandermonde determinants. Their test is based on the idea that if a one-dimensional function is convex, then the sample mean of the function values in a partition should be lower than certain linear combinations of the function values in neighboring partitions. Others fit cubic splines on the observations and use the second order derivatives at the knots to test for convexity, e.g. Diack and Thomas-Agnan (1998), Wang and Meyer (2011) and Meyer (2012). For higher dimensions, Abrevaya and Jiang (2005) work with small and localized sets of data points and count all the possible convex and concave simplices to construct a test statistic. Lau (1978) uses a second-order parametric model for the data points, and is a good survey of early literature.

A closely related field to convexity tests is convex regression, where one fits a regression model to observations under the constraint that the fitted model is convex. Work in this direction includes Judge and Takayama (1966), Allon et al. (2007), Seijo and Sen (2010), Hannah and Dunson (2011), Lim and Glynn (2012), among which Seijo and Sen (2010) provides a review of past work.

In this paper, we give a Bayesian sequential algorithm that iteratively collects noisy evaluations of an unknown function g on a fixed and finite set of design points $\boldsymbol{x}$, and uses them to estimate the posterior probability that the function, when restricted to the design points, is convex. Our approach differs from previous research in two main ways. First, since the function estimates are obtained via Monte Carlo simulation, we can only observe the function g on a finite set of points $\boldsymbol{x}$. Thus the best we can provide is a probabilistic guarantee that there exists a convex function that coincides with the unknown function g at those points. Even if there exists such a convex function, it does not imply that g itself is convex, although nonexistence does imply nonconvexity of g. Second, we use a Bayesian conjugate prior model that updates a posterior on the function values every time we collect a set of new samples. Then the posterior probability of convexity is estimated separately through Monte Carlo simulation. Instead of having a fixed running time, as is the case with hypothesis testing, our algorithm can be stopped at any stage to output an estimated probability of convexity. Indeed, the Bayesian approach avoids the difficulty in frequentist hypothesis testing of multiple "looks" at the data, for example to decide when to terminate the test.

Our overall approach is to successively update a posterior distribution on the vector of (true) function values $\boldsymbol{g}$. In doing so we assume that the noise in the estimated function values is normally distributed and assume a conjugate prior so that we can use standard posterior updates. In simulation the normality assumption is common and reasonable, since one can batch multiple replications to obtain approximate normality through the central limit theorem. For a given posterior distribution, computing the probability of convexity for a sample from the posterior appears to be difficult. We use Monte Carlo to estimate this probability, providing three methods for reducing the variance of the Monte Carlo estimator of the posterior probability of convexity. The change of measure and acceptance-rejection methods reuse samples obtained in an earlier iteration to construct an unbiased estimator for the current iteration. These two methods can be useful in any sequential algorithm in a Bayesian framework, but need to be used with caution due to heavy-tailed behavior of the likelihood ratio that is needed in these methods. The conditional Monte Carlo method takes advantage of the spherical property of Gaussian and t distributions. It can be applied to the more general problem of estimating the probability that a Gaussian or t-distributed random vector lies in a polyhedron, which might arise, e.g., in solving linear feasibility problems described in Szechtman and Yücesan (2016).

This paper is built upon Jian et al. (2014), with the addition of new results, complete proofs, new variance reduction methods, and more extensive numerical results. Full proof to Theorems 1, 2, and Proposition 1 can be found in the appendices.

Notation: We use upper case Latin letters for random variables or sets, and lower case Latin letters for deterministic variables. Vectors are in bold, and matrices are in upper case Greek letters. We use A^T to denote the transpose of the matrix A. For a set S, S° is its interior. We use $\Rightarrow$ for convergence in distribution, and $\mathbb{1}\{B\}$ is the indicator function that takes the value 1 on the event B and 0 otherwise.

2. Problem Statement and Assumptions

Suppose we can obtain noisy evaluations of a real-valued function $g : S \to \mathbb{R}$ over a fixed and finite set of design points $\boldsymbol{x} = \{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_r\}$, $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$ in $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Ideally, we would like to know whether the function g is convex on S or not. In the absence of any regularity assumptions on g, such as are assumed in Juditsky and Nemirovski (2002), it appears that this question cannot be addressed in finite time. The rest of this paper

is focused on giving a probabilistic guarantee on the convexity of the finite-dimensional vector obtained by restricting the function g to the r points in $\boldsymbol{x}$, i.e., we restrict attention to $\boldsymbol{g} = (g(\boldsymbol{x}_1), g(\boldsymbol{x}_2), \ldots, g(\boldsymbol{x}_r)) \in \mathbb{R}^r$.

DEFINITION 1. Given a finite set of points $\boldsymbol{x}$, we define a vector $\boldsymbol{g}$ to be convex if and only if there exists a convex function g whose values on $\boldsymbol{x}$ coincide with $\boldsymbol{g}$, i.e. $g(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{g}$.

DEFINITION 2. Define $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r$ to be the set of all convex vectors on $\boldsymbol{x} = (\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_r)$, so that $\boldsymbol{g}$ is convex if and only if $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{C}$.

The notion of vector convexity is weaker than (the usual) functional convexity, since if a function g is convex then its restriction $\boldsymbol{g}$ on $\boldsymbol{x}$ is convex under our definition. The converse is not true since we can arbitrarily extend $\boldsymbol{g}$.

The set $\mathbb{C}$ is a convex cone. In Section 5, we will see that $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{C}$ if and only if a certain linear system is feasible, and the linear system is then a tool to verify vector convexity. We will also show that $\boldsymbol{g}$ is strictly convex (in the sense that a strictly convex function g exists that agrees with $\boldsymbol{g}$ on $\boldsymbol{x}$) iff $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{C}^\circ$ in Appendix D.

We use a Bayesian approach, regarding $\boldsymbol{g}$ as an unknown realization from the prior distribution of a random vector $\boldsymbol{f}$. Let $(\boldsymbol{\xi}_j : j = 1, 2, \ldots)$ be an i.i.d. sequence of r-dimensional Gaussian random vectors, each with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix Γ, that is independent of $\boldsymbol{f}$. Our jth observation is then $\boldsymbol{Y}_j$, where $\boldsymbol{Y}_j = \boldsymbol{f} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_j$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. We denote the ith component of the vector $\boldsymbol{Y}_j$ by Y_{ij}, and interpret it as the jth sampled function value at the point $\boldsymbol{x}_i$.

The covariance matrix Γ is not necessarily diagonal, i.e., we do not necessarily constrain the observations to be (conditionally) independent between sampled points, conditional on $\boldsymbol{f}$. Thus, Common Random Numbers (CRN) can be employed within our framework. CRN induces positive correlation on the r dimensions of the noise $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, so that the structure of the underlying "true" function $\boldsymbol{f}$ can be better preserved than would be possible with conditionally independent observations (Chen et al. 2012). For simplicity, we assume throughout that the covariance matrix Γ is positive definite.

3. Sequential Algorithm

In our algorithm, the information gained after n iterations of sampling is represented by a σ-field $\mathscr{A}_n$. Initially, before any sampling, we fix the r points $\boldsymbol{x}_i, i = 1, \ldots, r$ and the prior mean μ_0 and covariance matrix Λ_0 of the assumed Gaussian prior distribution of $\boldsymbol{f}$. At the

beginning of the nth iteration ($n = 1, 2, \ldots$), we obtain a new observation $\boldsymbol{Y}_n$, and use that to update the posterior distribution on the function values, as described in Section 4. The information collected thus far is denoted $\mathscr{A}_n$, which is the sigma field generated from $\mathscr{A}_0$ and $\{\boldsymbol{Y}_j, j = 1, \ldots, n\}$. Thus, $\{\mathscr{A}_n\}_{n=0,1,2,\ldots}$ is a filtration. Once the posterior distribution has been updated, we separately estimate the posterior probability of convexity, $P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n)$ as discussed in Section 5. At the end of each iteration, we can choose either to stop, or to continue with the current posterior as the prior of the next iteration. More precisely, the algorithm is as follows.

Algorithm 1 A sequential method for testing for convexity of the function

Require: The Gaussian prior $P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \cdot|\mathscr{A}_0)$, with hyperparameters $\{\mu_0, \Lambda_0\}$ of the function values $\boldsymbol{f}$.

1: Initialize $n = 0$.
2: **repeat**
3: Set $n = n + 1$.
4: Obtain a new vector $\boldsymbol{y}_n$ of r noisy function values at $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_r$.
5: Update the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$ from the new samples $\boldsymbol{y}_n$ using $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_{n-1}$ as the prior, as in Section 4.
6: Estimate $p_n = P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n)$ from the distribution of $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$ using the Monte Carlo method described in Section 5, obtaining a confidence interval $[\hat{p}_n - h_n, \hat{p}_n + h_n]$.
7: **until** stopped
8: **return** A confidence interval $[\hat{p}_n - h_n, \hat{p}_n + h_n]$ of p.

In Step 6, the posterior probability that $\boldsymbol{f}$ is convex is estimated using Monte Carlo simulation. The samples are obtained from the posterior distribution $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$, unlike the samples from $\boldsymbol{f}$ used to update the posterior in Step 5. This avoids excessive sampling from the original $\boldsymbol{f}$, which may be computationally expensive.

4. Posterior Updates

We use a conjugate prior to update our belief about $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$ in each iteration n. Since we assumed that $\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{f} \sim N(\boldsymbol{0}, \Gamma)$, this conjugate prior is normal-normal when Γ is known, and normal-inverse-Wishart when Γ is unknown. In this section we give the updating formula of the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$ in Step 5 of Algorithm 1 under these two scenarios,

given the prior $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_{n-1}$. The formulae given here are standard; see, e.g., DeGroot (1970), Gelman et al. (2003), or Bernardo and Smith (2008).

4.1. Conjugate Prior under Known Sampling Variance

First, before any sampling we select a non-informative Gaussian prior with zero mean and large variance, i.e. $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_0 \sim N(\mu_0, \Lambda_0)$ in which $\mu_0 = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and $\Lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times r}$ is a diagonal matrix with diagonal values that are large relative to the sampling variance (the diagonal of Γ). Alternative parameters for the Gaussian prior could be used in the presence of more information, and would not change the algorithm.

At iteration $n > 1$, the posterior from the last iteration $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_{n-1} \sim N(\mu_{n-1}, \Lambda_{n-1})$ is used as the prior for the current iteration. We then obtain $s \geq 1$ new objective-function samples $(y_{ij}, j = 1, 2, \ldots, s)$ at each of the design points $\boldsymbol{x}_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. The mean μ_n and covariance Λ_n of the posterior $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n \sim N(\mu_n, \Lambda_n)$ are updated by

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_n^{-1} &= \Lambda_{n-1}^{-1} + s\Gamma^{-1} \\ \mu_n &= \Lambda_n(\Lambda_{n-1}^{-1}\mu_{n-1} + s\Gamma^{-1}\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the i-th component of the r-dimensional vector $\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}$ is $s^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{s}\boldsymbol{y}_{ij}$. One can adaptively choose the sample size s in each iteration, but for simplicity we use $s = 1$, meaning that only one new sample is obtained in each iteration.

The updating equation (1) involves matrix inversion. To reduce the computational effort, we use Cholesky factorization and the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula as detailed in Appendix E.

4.2. Conjugate Prior under Unknown Sampling Variance

When the sampling variance Γ is unknown, the inverse-Wishart distribution provides a conjugate prior. First, we use an uninformative Jeffrey's prior, where the prior joint distribution on $\boldsymbol{f}$ and Γ is proportional to $|\Gamma|^{-(r+1)/2}$ (Gelman et al. 2003) and $|A|$ denotes the determinant of the matrix A. To construct Jeffrey's prior, an initial set of r-dimensional samples $\boldsymbol{y}_j = (y_{ij}, i = 1, 2, \ldots, s), j = 1, 2, \ldots, s_0$ are used to estimate the parameters of the normal distribution for the mean $\boldsymbol{f}$ and the Inverse-Wishart distribution (Inv-Wishart) for the variance Γ. The initial sample size s_0 can be any positive integer. For a prior that reflects the data without being too costly, we choose $s_0 = r + 1$, where r is the number

of design points. This choice also ensures that the inverse-Wishart distribution is concentrated on covariance matrices that are positive definite. More specifically (Gelman et al. 2003),

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma|\mathscr{A}_0, \boldsymbol{y} &\sim \text{Inv-Wishart}_{\upsilon_0}(\Xi_0^{-1}) \\ \boldsymbol{f}|\Gamma, \mathscr{A}_0, \boldsymbol{y} &\sim N(\mu_0, \Gamma/\kappa_0), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where

$$\mu_0 = \frac{1}{s_0}\sum_{j=1}^{s_0} \boldsymbol{y}_j = \bar{\boldsymbol{y}}; \quad \kappa_0 = s_0; \quad \upsilon_0 = s_0 - 1; \quad \Xi_0 = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{s_0} (\boldsymbol{y}_j - \bar{\boldsymbol{y}})(\boldsymbol{y}_j - \bar{\boldsymbol{y}})^T\right)^{-1}.$$

In iteration $n \geq 1$, we obtain s samples y_{ij} on each of the points $\boldsymbol{x}_i, i = 1, \ldots, r$ and update the posterior of

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma|\mathscr{A}_n &\sim \text{Inv-Wishart}_{\upsilon_n}(\Xi_n^{-1}) \\ \boldsymbol{f}|\Gamma, \mathscr{A}_n &\sim N(\mu_n, \Gamma/\kappa_n) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

by (Gelman et al. 2003):

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n &= \frac{\kappa_{n-1}}{\kappa_{n-1}+s}\mu_{n-1} + \frac{s}{\kappa_{n-1}+s}\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}; \quad \kappa_n = \kappa_{n-1} + s; \quad \upsilon_n = \upsilon_{n-1} + s; \\ \Xi_n &= \Xi_{n-1} + S + \frac{\kappa_{n-1} s}{\kappa_{n-1}+s}(\bar{\boldsymbol{y}} - \mu_{n-1})(\bar{\boldsymbol{y}} - \mu_{n-1})^T, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where the i-th component of the r dimensional vector $\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}$ is defined as $\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{s} y_{ij}/s$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$, and the $r \times r$ matrix S is the sum of squared errors $\sum_{j=1}^{s}(\boldsymbol{y}_j - \bar{\boldsymbol{y}})(\boldsymbol{y}_j - \bar{\boldsymbol{y}})^T$. For simplicity we again choose $s = 1$ when updating, so that $\boldsymbol{y}_j = \bar{\boldsymbol{y}}$ and $S = 0$.

If a random $r \times r$ matrix Γ has the Inverse-Wishart distribution with parameters υ and Ξ^{-1}, whose density is proportional to $|\Xi|^{\upsilon/2}|\Gamma|^{-(\upsilon-r-1)/2}\exp\{-\text{tr}(\Xi\Gamma^{-1})/2\}$, where $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ is the trace of a matrix, the inverse Γ^{-1} has the Wishart distribution with parameters υ and Ξ. The Wishart distribution is a higher-dimensional generalization of the χ^2 distribution, and thus can be expressed similarly as the sum of squares of Gaussian random vectors. To generate a $\text{Wishart}_{\upsilon}(\Xi)$ distributed random matrix Γ, we generate $\upsilon > r$ independent, r-dimensional random vectors W_i distributed as $N(0, \Xi)$, and return $\Gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{\upsilon} W_i W_i^T$.

With the posterior covariance distributed as Inverse-Wishart and the posterior mean distributed as Gaussian conditioning on the covariance, the marginal distribution of the posterior mean $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$ is

$$\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n \sim t_{(\upsilon_n - r + 1)}(\mu_n, \Xi_n/(\kappa_n(\upsilon_n - r + 1))), \tag{5}$$

where $t_{(\upsilon_n-r+1)}(\mu_n, \Xi_n/(\kappa_n(\upsilon_n-r+1)))$ is a multivariate Student-t distribution with $(\upsilon_n - r+1)$ degrees of freedom, location parameter μ_n, and scale matrix $\Xi_n/(\kappa_n(\upsilon_n-r+1))$. The density function of $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$ is thus proportional to $|\Xi_n/(\kappa_n(\upsilon_n-r+1))|^{-1/2}\{1+(\boldsymbol{f}-\mu_n)^T[\Xi_n/(\kappa_n(\upsilon_n-r+1))]^{-1}(\boldsymbol{f}-\mu_n)\}^{-(\upsilon_n+1)/2}$ (Gelman et al. 2003).

5. Convexity

Recall that $\boldsymbol{g}=(g(\boldsymbol{x}_1), g(\boldsymbol{x}_2), \ldots, g(\boldsymbol{x}_r))$, and the vector $\boldsymbol{g}$ is defined to be convex if and only if there exists a convex function that coincides with $\boldsymbol{g}$ on the set of points $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_r$. Equivalently, for each $i=1,\ldots,r$ there exists a hyperplane $\{\boldsymbol{a}_i^T\boldsymbol{x}+b_i : \boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d\}$ that goes through $(\boldsymbol{x}_i, g(\boldsymbol{x}_i))$ and lies at or below all the other points $(\boldsymbol{x}_j, g(\boldsymbol{x}_j)), j\neq i$ (Murty 1988, p.539; Atlason et al. 2004). That is, $\boldsymbol{g}$ is convex if and only if there exists feasible solutions $\boldsymbol{a}_i\in\mathbb{R}^d, i=1,\ldots,r$ and $\boldsymbol{b}\in\mathbb{R}^r$ to the linear system

$$\begin{aligned} &\boldsymbol{a}_i^T\boldsymbol{x}_i+\boldsymbol{b}_i = g(\boldsymbol{x}_i), \text{ for all } i\in\{1,\ldots,r\} \\ &\boldsymbol{a}_i^T\boldsymbol{x}_j+\boldsymbol{b}_i \leq g(\boldsymbol{x}_j), \text{ for all } i\in\{1,\ldots,r\} \text{ and } j\neq i,\ j\in\{1,\ldots,r\}, \end{aligned} \tag{LS}$$

with $\boldsymbol{b}_i$ being the i-th component of $\boldsymbol{b}$. Let the set of all $\boldsymbol{g}$ such that the corresponding LS is feasible be $\mathbb{C}$, which denotes the set of all convex vectors $\boldsymbol{g}$ with regard to the r design points $\boldsymbol{x}_1,\ldots,\boldsymbol{x}_r$.

This large linear system can also be decomposed into r sub-systems, indexed by $i=1,\ldots,r$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\boldsymbol{a}_i^T\boldsymbol{x}_i+b_i = g(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \\ &\boldsymbol{a}_i^T\boldsymbol{x}_j+b_i \leq g(\boldsymbol{x}_j), \text{ for all } j\neq i \text{ and } j\in\{1,\ldots,r\}, \end{aligned} \tag{LS(i)}$$

each with the variables $\boldsymbol{a}_i\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and $b_i\in\mathbb{R}$.

Transforming the question of whether a vector is convex to the feasibility of r linear systems allows us to use Monte Carlo simulation to estimate the posterior probability of convexity at the end of each iteration n. We first simulate m random samples from the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$. Then, for each generated sample, we determine feasibility (or lack thereof) for the linear systems (LS(i), $i=1,\ldots,r$) in sequence. If *any* linear system is infeasible then we stop (skip the rest of the systems) and conclude that this generated sample is not convex, since one cannot define an appropriate hyperplane. The probability $P(\boldsymbol{f}\in\mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n)$ is then estimated by the sample average of the indicators of convexity for each sample as described more formally in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Subroutine used in Step 6 of Algorithm 1 to estimate $P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n)$.

Require: The posterior marginal density of $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$ from (1) or (5).

Generate independent samples $\{\boldsymbol{y}_n^1, \boldsymbol{y}_n^2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_n^m\}$ from the posterior marginal density of $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$.
for k from 1 to m **do**
  Set $\mathbb{1}\left\{\boldsymbol{y}_n^k \in \mathbb{C}\right\} = 1$.
  for i from 1 to r **do**
    Set $g(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$ as the i-th component of $\boldsymbol{y}_n^k$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$.
    Solve for the feasibility of LS(i).
    if LS(i) is infeasible **then**
      Set $\mathbb{1}\left\{\boldsymbol{y}_n^k \in \mathbb{C}\right\} = 0$.
      BREAK the inner loop and go to next k.
    end if
  end for
end for
return The center $\hat{p}_n = \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{1}\left\{\boldsymbol{y}_n^k \in \mathbb{C}\right\}/m$ and half-width $h_n = 1.96 s_n/\sqrt{m}$ of a 95% confidence interval for $P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n)$, where s_n is the sample standard deviation of $\mathbb{1}\left\{\boldsymbol{y}_n^k \in \mathbb{C}\right\}, k = 1, \ldots, m$.

6. Asymptotic Validity of the Main Algorithm

We now establish that the posterior probability of convexity converges to 1 or 0, depending on whether $\boldsymbol{g}$ is convex or not, with one qualification. If $\boldsymbol{g}$ is convex but not strictly convex then it lies on the boundary of $\mathbb{C}$, and then certain arbitrarily small perturbations of the function values $\boldsymbol{g}$ will yield points outside $\mathbb{C}$. Since we estimate the function values $\boldsymbol{g}$ using simulation, we cannot rule out such perturbations, and so we should not expect the posterior probability of convexity to converge to 1 or 0. Accordingly, we only show that when $\boldsymbol{f}$ is strictly convex then the posterior probability of convexity converges to 1, and when $\boldsymbol{f}$ is not convex the posterior probability of convexity converges to 0. The remaining case where $\boldsymbol{f}$ lies on the boundary of $\mathbb{C}$ has probability 0 under our prior, which has a density with respect to Lebesgue measure.

THEOREM 1. *Let $p_n = P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n)$ be the n-iteration posterior probability that $\boldsymbol{f}$ is convex as in Algorithm 1. As the number of iterations $n \to \infty$, $p_n - \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}\} \to 0$ a.s.*

Jian et al. (2014) has a sketch of the proof in the known variance case. We provide a complete proof that covers both the known and unknown variance cases in Appendix A.

The result of Theorem 1 relates to the exact posterior probability of convexity, which we estimate using Monte Carlo. We next show that the Monte Carlo estimator from Section 5 of the exact probability converges to the same indicator provided that the Monte Carlo sample sizes increase without bound, through a uniform law of large numbers.

COROLLARY 1. *Let p_n^m be the m-sample estimator of $P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n)$ from Algorithm 2. As $n \to \infty$ and $m = m(n) \to \infty$, $p_n^m - \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}\} \to 0$ in probability.*

Proof. We have $|p_n^m - \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}\}| \le |p_n^m - p_n| + |p_n - \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}\}|$, where $p_n = P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n)$ and $p_n^m = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{y}_n^k \in \mathbb{C}\}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. For the first term, Chebyshev's inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} P(|p_n^m - p_n| > \epsilon) &= EP\left(\left|\frac{1}{m}\sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{y}_n^k \in \mathbb{C}\} - P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n)\right| > \epsilon \middle| \mathscr{A}_n\right) \\ &\le E\left(\frac{Var(\mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{y}_n^k \in \mathbb{C}\}|\mathscr{A}_n)}{m\epsilon^2}\right) \le \frac{1}{4m\epsilon^2} \to 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$ since $m = m(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. This shows that $p_n^m - p_n \to 0$ in probability as $n \to \infty$. Also Theorem 1 shows that $|p_n - \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}\}| \to 0$ in probability as $n \to \infty$.

7. Variance Reduction Methods

In this section, we improve the vanilla Monte Carlo method through three variance-reduction methods. The change of measure and acceptance-rejection methods are likelihood-ratio-based methods that reuse samples generated in an earlier iteration, and the conditional Monte Carlo method reduces the variance through smoothing.

7.1. Change of Measure

Algorithm 2 can be computationally costly due to the need to solve up to mr linear feasibility problems LS(i), where m is the number of Monte Carlo samples and r is the number of design points. We can reduce the computational effort by reusing samples generated in a previous iteration through a change-of-measure method. The resulting estimator is based on the same principle used in the score-function method for simulation optimization (Rubinstein and Shapiro 1990), and that used in "green simulation" (Feng and Staum 2015). We will see that the resulting estimator is unbiased and has finite variance, but does not perform as well as we might hope.

Recall that in iteration n, Algorithm 2 generates m i.i.d. samples $\{\boldsymbol{y}_n^k : k = 1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ from the posterior marginal distribution of $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$ and produces m indicators $\{\mathbb{1}\left\{\boldsymbol{y}_n^k \in \mathbb{C}\right\} : k = 1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ of convexity. To reuse these samples, in iteration $n+\ell$, we instead output

$$\hat{p}_{n+\ell} = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{k=1}^{m} \mathbb{1}\left\{\boldsymbol{y}_n^k \in \mathbb{C}\right\} L_{n+\ell,n}(\boldsymbol{y}_n^k) \tag{6}$$

as an estimate of $p_{n+\ell} = P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_{n+\ell})$, where $L_{n+\ell,n}(\cdot) = \phi_{n+\ell}(\cdot)/\phi_n(\cdot)$ is the likelihood ratio of the densities of $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_{n+\ell}$ and $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$.

THEOREM 2. *The change of measure estimator $\hat{p}_{n+\ell} = \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{Y}_n \in \mathbb{C}\}L_{n+\ell,n}(\boldsymbol{Y}_n)$ is (conditionally) unbiased and has finite conditional variance, conditional on $\mathscr{A}_{n+\ell}$ for any n and $\ell \geq 1$.*

The proof for the known Γ case can be found in Jian et al. (2014), and we provide a proof for the unknown Γ case in Appendix B.

Given that the change of measure estimator is unbiased and has finite variance, it is tempting to generate a single sample and re-use it for many iterations to save computational effort. Unfortunately, such an estimator has poor empirical performance. Figure 3 gives an example where the estimated probability of convexity is greater than 1. This happens especially later in the run when all of the linear systems are feasible, and the likelihood ratios $L_{n+\ell,n}(\boldsymbol{y}_k^n)$ occasionally take very large values.

Occasional large values of the likelihood ratio $L_{n+\ell,n}(\boldsymbol{y})$ might arise when the sample $\boldsymbol{y}$ is generated within the tail of ϕ_n. Indeed, Proposition 1 below shows that in at least one special case, $L_{n+\ell,n}$ has a heavy tail given any sampling trajectory $\mathscr{A}_n$. At first sight, this may appear to contradict Theorem 2, which states that given the posterior information $\mathscr{A}_{n+\ell}$ in iteration $n+\ell$, the change of measure estimator is bounded. But notice that in Theorem 2 we are conditioning on more information than in Proposition 1. In effect, Proposition 1 shows that given the posterior information $\mathscr{A}_n$ in iteration n, the change of measure procedure in iteration $n+\ell$ could have poor behavior, depending on the (random) samples that are used to update $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_{n+\ell}$ from $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$. Thus there is no contradiction between these two results.

PROPOSITION 1. *When Γ is known and $r = 1$, given $\mathscr{A}_n$, $C_n = \sup_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{R}^r} L_{n+1,n}(\boldsymbol{y})$ asymptotically (as $n \to \infty$) has the same distribution as $e^{\chi_1^2}$, where χ_1^2 is a non-central chi-square random variable with 1 degree of freedom.*

In fact, the proof for Proposition 1 in Appendix C applies to when n is finite too. In that case $\ln C_n$, conditional on $\mathscr{A}_n$, is a non-central chi-square random variable scaled by a constant of order $O(1/n)$ and shifted by another constant of order $O(1/n)$. The conclusion of Proposition 1 can be generalized to $r > 1$ when Γ is known and diagonal. Indeed, when Γ is diagonal the likelihood ratio decomposes into a product, so that $\ln C_n = \ln(\sup_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{R}^r} L_{n+1,n}(\boldsymbol{y})) = \sup_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{R}^r} \ln(\prod_{i=1}^r L_{n+1,n}(\boldsymbol{y}_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^r \sup_{\boldsymbol{y}_i\in\mathbb{R}} \ln L_{n+1,n}(\boldsymbol{y}_i)$. Proposition 1 then allows us to conclude that, conditional on $\mathscr{A}_n$, this is asymptotically conditionally distributed as $\chi_r^2/2$, where χ_r^2 is a non-central chi-square random variable with r degress of freedom. Since the tail probability of $\chi_r^2/2$ at a given point increases in r, we expect this heavy tail behavior to be more significant as r increases, i.e., as the number of design points increases. We conjecture that the likelihood ratio is similarly heavy-tailed in the cases where Γ is known but not necessarily diagonal and when Γ is unknown.

In summary, conditional on $\mathscr{A}_{n+\ell}$, the estimator $\hat{p}_{n+\ell}$ is unbiased and has finite variance, but its distribution may be heavy tailed given $\mathscr{A}_n$ only, depending on the samples obtained to update to $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_{n+\ell}$. Thus this estimator needs to be used with caution. We suggest that if the method is to be used, then one should do so with small ℓ, e.g., $\ell < 5$, based on simulation experiments described later.

7.2. Acceptance/Rejection

The change of measure estimator reuses all the samples obtained in an earlier iteration by outputting a Monte Carlo estimator that scales each indicator $\{I_n^k = \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{Y}_n^k \in \mathbb{C}\} : k = 1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ by a likelihood ratio $L_{n+\ell,n}(\boldsymbol{Y}_n^k) = \phi_{n+1}(\boldsymbol{Y}_n^k)/\phi_n(\boldsymbol{Y}_n^k)$, where ϕ_n is the posterior density. An alternative is to reuse a subset of the samples from the previous iteration through acceptance-rejection.

Suppose that in iteration n, we have m i.i.d. Monte Carlo samples $\{\boldsymbol{y}_n^k : k = 1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ from $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$, together with the indicators $\{I_n^k = \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{y}_n^k \in \mathbb{C}\} : k = 1, 2, \ldots, m\}$. Then, at iteration $n+1$, the k-th sample $\boldsymbol{y}_k^n$ will be accepted (reused) with probability $L_{n+1,n}(\boldsymbol{y}_k^n)/c$, where $c \geq \sup\{L_{n+1,n}(\boldsymbol{y}) : \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^r\}$. If the accepted indices are $A \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, then $m - |A|$ additional samples can be generated from $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_{n+1}$ to ensure a total of m samples. The estimator is then just the usual Monte Carlo estimator based on all m samples, i.e., $\hat{p}_{n+1} = \left(\sum_{k\in A} \mathbb{1}\left\{\boldsymbol{y}_k^n \in \mathbb{C}\right\} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-|A|} \mathbb{1}\left\{\boldsymbol{y}_k^{n+1} \in \mathbb{C}\right\}\right)/m$.

When the sampling variance Γ is known, optimization shows that c is given by

$$\left\{\frac{|\Lambda_n|}{|\Lambda_{n+1}|} \exp\left[(\Lambda_{n+1}^{-1}\mu_{n+1} - \Lambda_n^{-1}\mu_n)^T\Gamma(\Lambda_{n+1}^{-1}\mu_{n+1} - \Lambda_n^{-1}\mu_n) + \mu_n^T\Lambda_n^{-1}\mu_n - \mu_{n+1}^T\Lambda_{n+1}^{-1}\mu_{n+1}\right]\right\}^{1/2},$$

where the parameters $\mu_n, \Lambda_n, \mu_{n+1}, \Lambda_{n+1}$ are defined as in Section 3. When Γ is unknown, c is the maximum of a ratio of polynomials and does not have a closed form, so we calculate it numerically.

The acceptance-rejection estimator is simply an average of i.i.d. samples, like the pure Monte Carlo estimator. The difference lies in how the samples are obtained. The probability of accepting a sample generated in iteration n is $1/c$, so the efficiency of this method is related to the constant c. According to Proposition 1, the likelihood $L_{n+1,n}(y)$ can take very large values, meaning that c can often be large. When c is large, very few of the earlier samples might be reused, so the majority of the m samples needed in the $(n+1)$th iteration are new. This may lower the efficiency of the acceptance-rejection method.

7.3. Conditional Monte Carlo

We can view a sample from the posterior distribution as consisting of both a direction Z on the $(r-1)$-sphere S^{r-1} and a step size T along that direction. We condition on the direction Z, and integrate the posterior over the interval of step sizes $[t_{\min}, t_{\max}]$ that yield points inside the convexity cone $\mathbb{C}$. Averaging the results over a number of uniformly generated directions gives an estimate of our desired probability.

For convenience, let $E_n(\cdot) = E(\cdot|\mathscr{A}_n)$ and $P_n(\cdot) = P(\cdot|\mathscr{A}_n)$. If $X \sim N(0, I)$ (known variance) or $X \sim t_{\nu_n}(0, I)$ (unknown variance), then

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n) &= E_n\left(\mathbb{1}\left\{\Lambda_n^{1/2} X + \mu_n \in \mathbb{C}\right\}\right) \\
&= E_n\left(\mathbb{1}\left\{T\Lambda_n^{1/2} Z + \mu_n \in \mathbb{C}\right\}\right), \text{ for } Z \text{ uniform on } S^{r-1} \\
&= E_n\left(E_n\left(\mathbb{1}\left\{T\Lambda_n^{1/2} Z + \mu_n \in \mathbb{C}\right\}|Z\right)\right) \\
&= E_n(P_n(T \in [t_{\min}(Z), t_{\max}(Z)]\,|Z)) \\
&= E_n(F_{T|Z}(t_{\max}(Z)) - F_{T|Z}(t_{\min}(Z))).
\end{aligned}$$

Here $F_{T|Z}$ is the conditional distribution function of T given $\mathscr{A}_n$ and Z. Thus, the posterior probability $P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n)$ can be estimated using $F_{T|Z}$ and a way to calculate $t_{\max}(Z)$ and $t_{\min}(Z)$. Theorem 3 gives the former, and linear programs LS(i) (below) give the latter.

THEOREM 3 **(Distribution of $T|Z$).** *When the sampling variance Γ is known, $F_{T|Z}(t) = (1 + sign(t)F_{\chi_r^2}(t^2))/2$, where $F_{\chi_r^2}(\cdot)$ is the (cumulative) distribution function of a χ^2 r.v. with r degrees of freedom. When Γ is unknown, $F_{T|Z}(t) = (1 + sign(t)F_{F(r,\nu_n)}(t^2/r))/2$, where $F_{F(r,\nu_n)}$ is the distribution function of the F distribution with r and ν_n degrees of freedom.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
&F_{T|Z}(t) = P_n(T \le t|Z)\\
=&\begin{cases} P_n(T \le 0|Z) + P_n(0 \le T \le t|Z), & \text{when } t \ge 0\\ P_n(T \le 0|Z) - P_n(0 \le T \le -t|Z), & \text{when } t < 0 \end{cases}\\
=&1/2 + \text{sign}(t)P(||X||^2 \le t^2|Z)/2, \text{ for } X = TZ
\end{aligned}$$

When Γ is known, $X \sim N(0, I)$, so $||X||^2 \sim \chi^2_r$. When Γ is unknown, $X \sim t_{\nu_n}(0, I) = N/\sqrt{Y/\nu_n}$ for independent $N \sim N(0, I)$ and $Y \sim \chi^2_{\nu_n}$. Therefore

$$||X||^2 = \frac{N^T N}{Y/\nu_n}$$

where $N^T N \sim \chi^2_r$, so $||X||^2/r \sim F(r, \nu_n)$.

To find $t_{\min}(Z)$ and $t_{\max}(Z)$, we can solve linear programs with objectives minimizing or maximizing t, with decision variables $t \in \mathbb{R}, \boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times d}, \boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and the constraints (LS), replacing $g(\boldsymbol{x})$ by $\mu + (\Lambda^{1/2}Z)t$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& t_{\min} = \min\ t \quad (t_{\max} = \max\ t)\\
\text{s.t.}\quad & \boldsymbol{a}^T\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{b} = \mu + (\Lambda^{1/2}Z)t\\
& \boldsymbol{a}_i^T\boldsymbol{x}_j + \boldsymbol{b}_i \le \mu_j + (\Lambda^{1/2}Z)_j t, \text{ for all } i \in \{1, \dots, r\} \text{ and } j \ne i,\ j \in \{1, \dots, r\}
\end{aligned} \tag{LP}$$

The linear program LP can be decomposed into r smaller LP's, with constraints LS(i) and variables $t \in \mathbb{R}, \boldsymbol{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^r, b_i \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& t_{\min}(i) = \min\ t \quad (t_{\max}(i) = \max\ t)\\
\text{s.t.}\quad & \boldsymbol{a}_i^T\boldsymbol{x}_i + b_i = \mu + (\Lambda^{1/2}Z)t\\
& \boldsymbol{a}_i^T\boldsymbol{x}_j + b_i \le \mu_j + (\Lambda^{1/2}Z)_j t, \text{ for all } j \ne i,\ j \in \{1, \dots, r\},
\end{aligned} \tag{LP(i)}$$

and then

$$t_{\min} = \max_{i=1,2,\dots,r} t_{\min}(i), \quad \text{and} \quad t_{\max} = \min_{i=1,2,\dots,r} t_{\max}(i).$$

This decomposition does not bring as much speed improvement as LS(i) does, because all the decomposed linear programs must be solved.

Now we have all the pieces needed for the conditional Monte Carlo method.

Algorithm 3 A conditional Monte Carlo estimator $\widetilde{p}_n$ for $p_n = P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n)$.

Require: Posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$ obtained from Algorithm 1 with mean μ_n and covariance Λ_n; Number of Monte Carlo samples m needed

1: **for** $k = 1, \ldots, m$ **do**
2: Uniformly generate a vector z_k on the surface of a unit sphere (by generating a standard Gaussian and normalizing it to a unit vector).
3: Determine integration boundaries $t_{\min}(z_k)$ and $t_{\max}(z_k)$.
4: Set $\widetilde{P}_n(k) = F_{T|Z}(t_{\max}(z_k)) - F_{T|Z}(t_{\min}(z_k))$.
5: **end for**
6: Calculate the mean p_n^m and standard deviation s_n^m of $(\widetilde{P}_n(k) : k = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$.
7: **return** $\widetilde{p}_n = p_n^m$ as an estimator of $P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n)$, along with the half-width $\tilde{h}_n = 1.96 s_n^m/\sqrt{m}$ of a 95% confidence interval.

Relative to the other variance-reduction methods, conditional Monte Carlo takes much longer to produce an estimate in each iteration because it needs to solve two linear programs LP and cannot "skip" any of them as can be done when solving the decomposed feasibility problems LS(i).

8. Numerical Results

In this section we show numerical results on some test functions, assuming the more realistic case that the sampling variance is unknown. To select the r sample points for a test function in d dimensions, we first sample $d+1$ points uniformly at random within the (assumed compact) sample space S, and for each such random point, we generate a uniform random direction on the surface of the unit sphere. Each point-direction pair defines a line segment within S. Then we sample 3 points uniformly at random on each line segment. This method generates $r = 3(d+1)$ sample points. We select the points to lie on $d+1$ line segments because doing so seems to improve the performance of the convexity test relative to just sampling points uniformly within S. In each iteration of the sequential algorithm, we use $m = 100$ Monte Carlo samples from the posterior predictive distribution to estimate a 95% confidence interval for p_n.

Our procedure is implemented in Matlab and freely available in an online repository (Jian 2017). The repository contains two versions. The first version uses only a standard

Matlab installation, solving linear programs using the built-in `linprog` function (Mathworks 2016). The second version requires the installation of the packages `CVX` (Grant and Boyd 2014, 2008), which is a package for specifying and solving convex programs, and `Gurobi` (Gurobi Optimization 2016), a commercial optimization solver. We suggest the second version if a user has the requisite licenses, since `Gurobi` seems more robust than `linprog`. For example, we have found cases where `linprog` was not able to find a feasible solution, whereas `Gurobi` did. However, because of the overhead of `CVX` in setting up the linear program in a format that `Gurobi` is able to read, `linprog` is usually faster when the problem dimension is low. When the problem dimension is high, the inefficiency of the interior-point-method used by `linprog` outweighs the overhead of `CVX`. Figure 1 compares solving times by these two solvers for the linear programs (LP), tested with the sample function $f(\boldsymbol{x}) = ||\boldsymbol{x}||^2, \boldsymbol{x} \in [-1, 1]^d$ for different values of d.



Figure 1 **The solving time vs. testing function dimension for the two linear programs in the conditional Monte Carlo method using `Gurobi` and `linprog`. `Gurobi` is faster when the dimension exceeds 10, when 33 sample points are used.**

All test cases are run on a desktop with a 4-core Intel Core i7-3770 3.40 GHz processor with 16G memory, running Matlab R2013a on 64-bit Windows 7.

8.1. A Strictly Convex Function

We use $f(\boldsymbol{x}) = ||\boldsymbol{x}||^2$ in this section as the test function.

First, we compare vanilla Monte Carlo with the variance reduction methods in Section 7, showing 95% confidence intervals for the estimated probability of convexity, the time per iteration, and the efficiency per iteration. Here the efficiency of the Monte Carlo estimator

$\tilde{p}_n$ is defined as the inverse of the product of the computational time per replication and the variance of one replication; see, e.g., Glynn and Whitt (1992). We first take the dimension $d = 1$, on the sample space $[-1, 1]$. The sampling covariance matrix has equal constant variances of 0.01 on the diagonal, and we use a Gaussian kernel of $10^{-4} \exp\{-||\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_j||^2/2\}$ for the off-diagonal components. Hence the noise at different points is positively correlated, and the correlation is stronger between closer points (Rasmussen and Williams 2005).

We use `linprog` instead of `Gurobi` to avoid the time overhead incurred by `CVX`, since the dimension $d = 1$. For the change of measure method, a new set of samples is obtained every iteration for the first 30 iterations, and every 5 iterations thereafter. For the acceptance-rejection method we start to reuse samples only after the first 30 iterations. Thus the first 30 iterations of these two methods are exactly the same as vanilla Monte Carlo.

Figure 2 shows that the estimated probability of convexity increases to 1 for all methods. Later in the iterations, the change of measure method can return greater-than-one estimates due to the poor behavior of the likelihood ratio as discussed in Section 7.1. Among all methods, the conditional Monte Carlo method has the smallest variance but takes the longest time to compute. (This difference in the computational time becomes more significant for higher-dimensional test functions when we later experiment on a 30-dimensional function.) For the 1-dimensional convex function here, taking both computational time and variance into consideration, we observe that conditional Monte Carlo has the highest overall efficiency. The efficiency of vanilla Monte Carlo is the lowest. The efficiency plots occasionally break when the sample variance of the estimator is 0, where all the linear systems (LS) are feasible. This also happens for the change of measure method because that method corresponds with vanilla Monte Carlo every 5 iterations after the first 30. The efficiency of the change of measure method and the acceptance-rejection method both increase whenever they reuse the samples from a previous iteration because the linear feasibility problems need not be solved. The change of measure method occasionally has a very large efficiency because of the small sample variance of the estimate. This happens in later iterations when the posterior density is very concentrated. In this case all the Monte Carlo samples are close to the mean, giving almost identical posterior densities and similar likelihood ratios. When all reused samples are convex (corresponding to the iterations where the vanilla Monte Carlo method has infinite estimated efficiency), the change of measure estimator has almost 0 variance. However, due to the heavy tail behavior of the likelihood



Figure 2 **Comparisons of the estimated probability of convexity, the iteration time (in seconds), and the log (base 10) efficiency (left to right) of vanilla Monte Carlo, change of measure, acceptance-rejection, and conditional-Monte-Carlo (top to bottom) methods applied to a one-dimensional strictly convex function.**

ratio, it is risky to trust the change of measure estimator values, as we see when the change of measure method estimates a probability greater than 1. The acceptance-rejection estimator has slightly lower estimated efficiency, but the estimator is more trustworthy in that it is statistically identical to vanilla Monte Carlo.

Consider now the 30-dimensional test function $f(x) = ||x||^2, x \in [-10, 10]^{30}$ with $r = 3(d+1) = 93$ sample points. The covariance matrix Γ has diagonal entries $\Gamma_{ii} = 0.04 f^2(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$,

and off-diagonal entries $\Gamma_{ij} = 10^{-2}\exp\{-||\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_j||^2/2\}0.04f(\boldsymbol{x}_i)f(\boldsymbol{x}_j)$. Hence the variance depends on the function value, and there is also modest positive correlation between any two design points depending on the distance between them. As before, for the change of measure method, a new set of samples is obtained every iteration for the first 30 iterations, and every 5 iterations thereafter, and for the acceptance-rejection method we start to reuse samples only after the first 30 iterations. We find that the change of measure and acceptance-rejection methods do not work very well on this example. Indeed, according to Proposition 1, the heavy-tail behavior of the likelihood ratio becomes more severe with more design points. With the likelihood ratio often taking very large values, the change of measure estimates evaluate to large values with wide confidence intervals, as shown in Figure 3 (notice the y-axis scale). Due to the same reason, the acceptance-rejection method reduces to vanilla Monte Carlo by rejecting almost all previous samples, so we omit that method from the results in Figure 3. In early iterations, conditional Monte Carlo takes more than 6 minutes to generate an estimate using `CVX` with `Gurobi` (`linprog` takes over 1 hour), and the iteration efficiency is around 0.20. In comparison, the vanilla Monte Carlo method only takes 80 seconds per iteration at the beginning of the iteration by solving the decomposed LS(i), giving around the same level of iteration efficiency. However, towards the end of the 100 iterations, conditional Monte Carlo is able to reduce the variance of the estimated probability so well that the efficiency improves beyond that of vanilla Monte Carlo. Therefore we recommend using conditional Monte Carlo (with `CVX` + `Gurobi`) if one can afford the running time, and vanilla Monte Carlo otherwise or when `CVX` is not installed.

8.2. A Non-Convex Function

Consider the function $f(\boldsymbol{x}) = -||\boldsymbol{x}||^2, \boldsymbol{x} \in [-1,1]^d$. In order to make the problem "harder," we choose the covariance matrix Γ to be $d^2/4$ on the diagonal, so that the sampling standard deviation is bigger than half of the function value, and 0 on the off-diagonal. Figure 4 gives the results from the vanilla Monte Carlo estimator, with acceptance-rejection applied after the initial 30 iterations, for varying dimensions. The estimated probabilities of convexity hover near zero over all iterations, especially in lower dimensions. This is perhaps intuitive: with few iterations the noise in the estimated function values dominates, and in the presence of large noise *any* function will appear to be nonconvex, while after many iterations, the nonconvexities of the (true) function dominate and are detected.



Figure 3 **The estimated probability of convexity, the iteration time (in seconds), and the log (base 10) efficiency (left to right) of the vanilla Monte Carlo, change of measure, and conditional Monte Carlo methods (top to bottom) applied to a 30-dimensional strictly convex function.**



Figure 4 **The estimated probability of convexity for the simple strictly non-convex function in dimensions 3 and 5 and 10 (from left to right). The estimates when the function is one-dimensional are not shown because they were effectively identically 0.**

8.3. Linear Function

Linear functions are convex but lie on the boundary of the cone $\mathbb{C}$. Theorem 1 does not inform us of the likely behaviour of our algorithm in this case, because the event that the

function lies on the boundary of $\mathbb{C}$ has measure 0 in the context of that result. Thus the posterior probability of convexity could converge to any number between 0 and 1 or not converge at all. Here we use a one-dimensional linear function $f(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0, \boldsymbol{x} \in [-1, 1]$, with a sampling covariance matrix that equals 10^{-4} on the diagonal and 0 on the off-diagonal.



Figure 5 **The estimated probability of convexity for a 1-dimensional linear function. The mean does not appear to converge.**

As shown in Figure 5, the estimated probability does not converge to 0 or 1, but stays close to 0. When we increase the dimension, e.g., to 5, and keep the sampling variance the same, the estimated probabilities stay at 0 throughout the first 100 iterations. Changing the sampling variance does not change the qualitative nature of results because when the function is zero-valued the sampling variance only changes the "scale" of the observations. These results are perhaps to be expected because a linear function would only appear convex when the function noise at all design points "happens to" form a strictly convex function.

8.4. Output of a Simulation

Finally, we have also tested our algorithm on a more realistic example similar to the "Ambulances in a Square" problem from SimOpt (Pasupathy and Henderson 2007). In this problem, patient calls arrive in a one kilometer unit square $[0, 1]^2$ according to a Poisson process at a constant rate of 1 call every 2 hours. The (x, y) locations of the calls are i.i.d. and distributed with a density proportional to $1.6 - (|x - 0.8| + |y - 0.8|)$. Upon receiving a call, a nearest ambulance is dispatched, traveling to the scene at a constant speed of 60 km/h. Once arriving at the scene, the ambulance spends a Gamma-distributed scene time

with mean 45 minutes and standard deviation 15 minutes, then returns to the base at a speed of 40 km/h if no other call is received. We are interested in the mean response time (time from when the call is received until the ambulance arrives at the call location) as a function of the location(s) of the ambulance base(s).

We sampled the base locations of the ambulance along ($4 \times$ the number of bases $+$ 1) random lines in the unit square, with 3 points sampled on each line. Each base has two coordinates, so this is equivalent to $3(2d+1)$ design points, where d is the dimension of the sample space. We are using more design points than in our previous test cases because we wanted to try more points (and consequently more computation) on a real case. Similar to our other experiments, we obtain a sample of the mean response time on each set of sampled base locations from running the simulation until 360 calls receive a response (approximately 30 days). The mean response times of the sampled base locations are evaluated using common random numbers, which compares the locations using the exact same random call arrivals and scene times. The convexity of the mean response time as a function of the ambulance base locations is tested with one, two, and three ambulance bases, using the conditional Monte Carlo method. The estimated probabilities vs. iteration are plotted in Figure 6.



Figure 6 **The estimated probability of convexity for the mean response time as a function of the base locations, when the number of bases is one, two, and three.**

It seems that the mean response time is convex as a function of the base location when there is only one base, while it is not convex for more than one ambulance base. This agrees with our intuition that the location of a single ambulance base should have one global minimizer in the unit square. By plotting the posterior mean function, we found that the minimizer is located near the point $[0.46, 0.54]$, near, but slightly offset from, the mode $[0.8, 0.8]$, to balance the travel time to the farther corner $[0, 0]$. However, when there

is more than one ambulance base, the objective does not have a single minimizer due to symmetry and the interactions between bases.

9. Conclusion

Given a function that can be observed on a finite number of points in the presence of noise, we have suggested a sequential algorithm to estimate the posterior probability that the function is convex. The method models the function values on a fixed set of design points using a Bayesian conjugate model, and estimates the probability of convexity by Monte Carlo simulation, using samples of the function values from the posterior distribution. This Bayesian procedure gives sequential estimates for function convexity. It is useful when a function is expensive to evaluate, e.g., the output of a large simulation, or when its values can only be obtained on a constrained set of points, e.g., a function defined on a discrete domain.

To improve the efficiency of our algorithm we have introduced three variance reduction methods - change of measure, acceptance-rejection, and conditional Monte Carlo. The first two methods reuse samples obtained in an earlier iteration to calculate an estimator in the current iteration. However, they both rely on the likelihood ratio of normal or Student-t posterior densities, which we prove could take extreme values due to its heavy-tail behavior. In our computational results, we observe that the change of measure method may give poor (e.g., greater than 1) estimates of the probability, and the acceptance-rejection method rejects most of the earlier samples and reduces to vanilla Monte Carlo when the number of design points is large. Finally, the conditional Monte Carlo method takes the longest to compute but is the most effective in variance reduction, giving the highest efficiency among all methods. We recommend using it with `CVX` and `Gurobi`, especially for high-dimensional functions, to ensure reasonable computational time.

A package containing the main algorithm and all variance reduction alternatives is available on Github (Jian 2017).

Appendix A: Proof of Theorem 1

First suppose that Γ is known. Proposition 5.16 of Bernardo and Smith (2008) then establishes that

$$\Lambda_n^{-1/2}(\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}) \Rightarrow N(0, I), \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{7}$$

Using the posterior updating equations (1) when Γ is known, we have $\Lambda_n^{-1} = \Lambda_0^{-1} + n\Gamma^{-1}$. The square root operator is continuous over the set of positive definite matrices, so it follows that $\Lambda_n^{-1/2} = (\Lambda_0^{-1} + n\Gamma^{-1})^{1/2} \sim \sqrt{n}\,\Gamma^{-1/2}$. Slutsky's theorem applied to (7) then yields $\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f} \to 0$ in probability as $n \to \infty$. (All norms are Euclidean in this proof.)

Now, $P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \partial\mathbb{C}) = 0$, where $\partial\mathbb{C}$ denotes the boundary of $\mathbb{C}$, since $\boldsymbol{f}$ has a density and $\partial\mathbb{C}$ is a union of a finite number of lower-dimensional faces. Thus, it is sufficient to consider the cases (i) $\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}^\circ$, the interior of $\mathbb{C}$, which corresponds to the set of strictly convex vectors (see Appendix D), and (ii) $\boldsymbol{f} \notin \mathbb{C}$.

On the event $\boldsymbol{f} \notin \mathbb{C}$, we can strictly separate the point $\boldsymbol{f}$ from $\mathbb{C}$ by a hyperplane. Hence we can define a random variable $D_{\boldsymbol{f}} > 0$ such that on the event $\boldsymbol{f} \notin \mathbb{C}$, all points in $\mathbb{C}$ are at least a distance $D_{\boldsymbol{f}}$ from $\boldsymbol{f}$. (Arbitrarily define $D_{\boldsymbol{f}} = 1$ on the event $\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}$.) Let $Z \sim N(0, I)$ be a standard normal random vector, defined on the same probability space as all other random variables, and independent of all else. On the event $\boldsymbol{f} \notin \mathbb{C}$, and using the fact that $\boldsymbol{f}$ has a normal posterior distribution with parameters μ_n and Λ_n,

$$\begin{aligned}
p_n - \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}\} &= P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n) - 0 \\
&= P(\mu_n + \Lambda_n^{1/2} Z \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n) \\
&\le P(\|\mu_n + \Lambda_n^{1/2} Z - \boldsymbol{f}\| \ge D_{\boldsymbol{f}}|\mathscr{A}_n) \\
&\le P(\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \ge D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2|\mathscr{A}_n) + P(\|\Lambda_n^{1/2} Z\| \ge D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2|\mathscr{A}_n).
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Consider the first random variable $R_n = P(\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \ge D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2|\mathscr{A}_n)$ in (8). Then $R_n \ge 0$ and $ER_n = P(\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \ge D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2)$. We will show that this expectation converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$, and hence by Markov's inequality, it immediately follows that $R_n \to 0$ in probability as $n \to \infty$.

To this end, since $D_{\boldsymbol{f}} > 0$, for any $\epsilon > 0$ we can find $\delta > 0$ such that $P(D_{\boldsymbol{f}} \le \delta) \le \epsilon$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \ge D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2) &= P(\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \ge D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2, D_{\boldsymbol{f}} \le \delta) + P(\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \ge D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2, D_{\boldsymbol{f}} > \delta) \\
&\le P(D_{\boldsymbol{f}} \le \delta) + P(\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \ge \delta/2) \\
&\le \epsilon + P(\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \ge \delta/2).
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

But $\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ in probability, so the second term in (9) converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$, and since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we see that $ER_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

A similar approach works for the second term, $R_n' = P(\|\Lambda_n^{1/2} Z\| \ge D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2|\mathscr{A}_n)$. Again, R_n' is non-negative, so that if its expectation $P(\|\Lambda_n^{1/2} Z\| \ge D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, then R_n' also converges to 0 in probability. As before, for any $\epsilon > 0$ we can find $\delta > 0$ such that $P(D_{\boldsymbol{f}} \le \delta) \le \epsilon$. Hence, as in (9)

$$P(\|\Lambda_n^{1/2} Z\| \ge D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2) \le \epsilon + P(\|\Lambda_n^{1/2} Z\| \ge \delta/2).$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\|\Lambda_n^{1/2}Z\| \geq \delta/2) &\leq P(\|\Lambda_n^{1/2}\| \, \|Z\| \geq \delta/2) \\ &= P(\|Z\|^2 \geq t_n), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$t_n = \frac{\delta^2}{4} \frac{1}{\|\Lambda_n^{1/2}\|^2} \geq \frac{\delta^2}{4\|\Lambda_n\|}.$$

Now, $\Lambda_n \sim \Gamma/n$, hence $\Lambda_n^{1/2} \sim \Gamma^{1/2}/\sqrt{n}$, and so Markov's inequality gives

$$P(\|Z\|^2 \geq t_n) \leq \frac{r}{t_n} = \frac{4r\|\Lambda_n^{1/2}\|^2}{\delta^2} \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$.

We thus conclude that (8) converges to 0 in probability as $n \to \infty$. Since $(p_n : n \geq 0)$ is a uniformly integrable martingale, it converges almost surely Williams (1991), and hence the almost sure limit is $\mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{f} \in C\}$.

On the other hand, on the event $\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}^\circ$ we redefine $D_{\boldsymbol{f}}$ to be the radius of a ball, centered at $\boldsymbol{f}$, that is wholly contained in $\mathbb{C}$, and off this event we redefine $D_{\boldsymbol{f}} = 1$. We then find that, on the event $\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}^\circ$,

$$\begin{aligned} p_n - \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}\} &= P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n) - 1 \\ &= P(\mu_n + \Lambda_n^{1/2}Z \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n) - 1 \\ &\geq P(\|\mu_n + \Lambda_n^{1/2}Z - \boldsymbol{f}\| \leq D_{\boldsymbol{f}}|\mathscr{A}_n) - 1 \\ &\geq P(\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \leq D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2, \|\Lambda_n^{1/2}Z\| \leq D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2|\mathscr{A}_n) - 1 \\ &\geq -P(\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \geq D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2|\mathscr{A}_n) - P(\|\Lambda_n^{1/2}Z\| \geq D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2|\mathscr{A}_n), \end{aligned}$$

and the proof follows as in the case where $\boldsymbol{f} \notin \mathbb{C}$. This concludes the proof when Γ is known.

Now consider the unknown variance case. From (5), $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$ follows a multivariate t distribution with $\upsilon_n - r + 1$ degrees of freedom, mean μ_n, and variance $\Lambda_n = \frac{\upsilon_n - r + 1}{\upsilon_n - r - 1}\Xi_n/(\kappa_n(\upsilon_n - r + 1))$. From (4), Ξ_n is of order n, and both υ_n and κ_n are of order n. Thus, $\Lambda_n \to \mathbf{0}$ as $n \to \infty$ a.s., where $\mathbf{0}$ is a matrix of zero components. By Proposition 5.14 of Bernardo and Smith (2008),

$$\Lambda_n^{-1/2}(\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}) \Rightarrow N(0, I), \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{10}$$

Then this together with $\Lambda_n \to \mathbf{0}$ a.s. yields $\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f} \to 0$ in probability as $n \to \infty$ by Slutsky's Theorem.

Again, it is sufficient to consider the cases $\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}^\circ$, the interior of $\mathbb{C}$, or $\boldsymbol{f} \notin \mathbb{C}$.

As before, on the event $\boldsymbol{f} \notin \mathbb{C}$, we can define a random variable $D_{\boldsymbol{f}} > 0$ such that $D_{\boldsymbol{f}} = 1$ on the event $f \in \mathbb{C}$, and such that on the event $f \notin \mathbb{C}$, all points in $\mathbb{C}$ are at least a distance $D_{\boldsymbol{f}}$ from $\boldsymbol{f}$. Let $Z \sim N(0, I)$ be a standard normal random vector, defined on the same probability space as all other random variables, and independent of all else. On the event $\boldsymbol{f} \notin \mathbb{C}$, we use the fact that $\boldsymbol{f}|\Gamma$ has a normal posterior distribution with parameters μ_n and Γ/κ_n and take $\Gamma^{1/2}$ to be the symmetric square root of Γ. Then

$$\begin{aligned} p_n - \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}\} &= P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n) - 0 \\ &= E(P(\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}|\mathscr{A}_n, \Gamma)|\mathscr{A}_n) \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= E(P(\mu_n + \Gamma^{1/2} Z/\sqrt{\kappa_n} \in \mathbb{C} | \mathscr{A}_n, \Gamma) | \mathscr{A}_n) \\
&\leq E(P(\|\mu_n + \Gamma^{1/2} Z/\sqrt{\kappa_n} - \boldsymbol{f}\| \geq D_{\boldsymbol{f}} | \mathscr{A}_n, \Gamma) | \mathscr{A}_n) \\
&\leq E(P(\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \geq D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2 | \mathscr{A}_n, \Gamma) | \mathscr{A}_n) \\
&\quad + E(P(\|\Gamma^{1/2} Z/\sqrt{\kappa_n}\| \geq D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2 | \mathscr{A}_n, \Gamma) | \mathscr{A}_n) \\
&= P(\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \geq D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2 | \mathscr{A}_n) + E(P(\|\Gamma^{1/2} Z/\sqrt{\kappa_n}\| \geq D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2 | \mathscr{A}_n, \Gamma) | \mathscr{A}_n). \qquad (11)
\end{aligned}
$$

The first term in (11) converges to 0 in probability exactly as before. The second term, R_n' say, is non-negative, so that if its expectation $P(\|\Gamma^{1/2} Z/\sqrt{\kappa_n}\| \geq D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, then R_n' also converges to 0 in probability. As before, for any $\epsilon > 0$ we can find $\delta > 0$ such that $P(D_{\boldsymbol{f}} \leq \delta) \leq \epsilon$ and hence

$$
E(R_n') \leq \epsilon + P(\|\Gamma^{1/2} Z/\sqrt{\kappa_n}\| \geq \delta/2). \qquad (12)
$$

Denoting the second term in (12) by Q_n, we see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q_n &\leq P(\|Z\| \|\Gamma^{1/2}\| \geq \delta\sqrt{\kappa_n}/2) \qquad (13) \\
&= P(\|Z\|^2 \geq \frac{\delta^2 \kappa_n}{4\|\Gamma^{1/2}\|^2}) \\
&\leq E(\frac{4r\|\Gamma^{1/2}\|^2}{\delta^2 \kappa_n}) \qquad (14) \\
&= \frac{4r}{\delta^2 \kappa_n} E(\lambda_{\max}(\Gamma)) \qquad (15) \\
&\leq \frac{4r}{\delta^2 \kappa_n} E(\mathrm{tr}(\Gamma)) \\
&= \frac{4r}{\delta^2 (n + \kappa_0)} \sum_{i=1}^{r} E(\Gamma_{ii}),, \qquad (16)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(\Gamma)$ denotes the maximum eigenvalue of Γ, and $\mathrm{tr}(\Gamma)$ denotes the trace of Γ. The step (15) is by the definition of Euclidean norm of a real and symmetric matrix with non-negative eigenvalues. In (13) we use the sub-multiplicative property of the Euclidean norm (Golub and Van Loan 1996), and (14) is by Markov's inequality. By the Jeffery's prior of $\Gamma | \mathscr{A}_n$ in (2), conditioning on an initial sample set $\boldsymbol{y}$, $\Gamma | \mathscr{A}_0, \boldsymbol{y} \sim \text{Inv-Wishart}_{\upsilon_0}(\Xi_0^{-1})$, with expectation $E(\Gamma) = (\upsilon_0 - \kappa_0 - 1)^{-1} \Xi_0^{-1}$. Thus the summation in (16) is finite, we conclude that $ER_n^{'} \to 0$ in probability, and further that $p_n - \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{f} \in C\} \to 0$ in probability by (11). Again, since $(p_n : n \geq 0)$ is a uniformly integrable martingale, it converges almost surely (Williams 1991), and hence the almost-sure limit is $\mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{f} \in C\}$.

On the other hand, in the case $\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}^\circ$, $p_n - \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}\} \geq -P(\|\mu_n - \boldsymbol{f}\| \geq D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2 | \mathscr{A}_n) - E(P(\|\Lambda_n^{1/2} Z\| \geq D_{\boldsymbol{f}}/2 | \mathscr{A}_n, \Gamma) | \mathscr{A}_n)$ and the proof follows similarly as above.

Appendix B: Proof of Theorem 2

First, similar to the known variance case, the distribution of $\boldsymbol{f} | \mathscr{A}_n$, being multivariate t, is absolutely continuous with respect to the distribution of $\boldsymbol{f} | \mathscr{A}_{n+\ell}$. Thus $E(\hat{p}_{n+\ell} | \mathscr{A}_{n+\ell}) = p_{n+\ell}$, and $\hat{p}_{n+\ell}$ is unbiased. It remains to show that $E(\hat{p}_{n+\ell}^2 | \mathscr{A}_{n+\ell}) < \infty$, so that conditional on $\mathscr{A}_{n+\ell}$ the estimator has finite second moment and hence variance.

When Γ is unknown, $\boldsymbol{f} | \mathscr{A}_n$ is distributed as multivariate t centered at μ_n with scale matrix $\Xi_n / [\kappa_n (\nu_n - r + 1)]$ and $\nu_n - r + 1$ degrees of freedom. Since $E(\hat{p}_{n+\ell}^2 | \mathscr{A}_{n+\ell}) = E(\mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{Y} \in \mathbb{C}\} L_{n+\ell,n}^2(\boldsymbol{Y}) | \mathscr{A}_{n+\ell})$, it suffices

to show that $L^2_{n+\ell,n}(\boldsymbol{y})$ is bounded in $\boldsymbol{y}$ for any n. We will do this by showing that the ratio of an upper bound on the numerator to a lower bound of the denominator is bounded. Moreover, it suffices to obtain such a bound outside a compact set, since t densities are bounded above, and are bounded below on any compact set. Hence, we need only show a bound outside a compact set C that will be successively defined as we proceed.

Let $\lambda_{\max}$ be the largest eigenvalue of $\Lambda_{n+\ell} = \Xi_{n+\ell}/\kappa_{n+\ell}$. Then the squared density of $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_{n+\ell}$ evaluated at $\boldsymbol{y}$ is proportional to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{1+(\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell})\Lambda^{-1}_{n+\ell}(\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell})/(\nu_{n+\ell}-r+1)\}^{-(\nu_{n+\ell}+1)} &(17)\\
&\leq \{1+(\lambda_{\max})^{-1}||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}||^2/(\nu_{n+\ell}-r+1)\}^{-(\nu_{n+\ell}+1)}\\
&\leq \left\{\frac{||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}||^2}{\lambda_{\max}(\nu_{n+\ell}-r+1)}\right\}^{-(\nu_{n+\ell}+1)}\\
&= c_1||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}||^{-2(\nu_{n+\ell}+1)}, &(18)
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant $c_1 = \{\lambda^+_{\max}(\nu_{n+\ell}-r+1)\}^{(\nu_{n+\ell}+1)}$. This constant depends on n but does not depend on $\boldsymbol{y}$.

Likewise, let $\lambda_{\min}$ be the smallest eigenvalue of $\Lambda_n = \Xi_n/\kappa_n$. Then the squared density of $\boldsymbol{f}|\mathscr{A}_n$ evaluated at $\boldsymbol{y}$ is proportional to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{1+(\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_n)\Lambda^{-1}_n(\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_n)/(\nu_n-r+1)\}^{-(\nu_n+1)}\\
&\geq \{1+\lambda^{-1}_{\min}||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_n||^2/(\nu_n-r+1)\}^{-(\nu_n+1)}\\
&\geq \left\{\frac{2||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_n||^2}{\lambda_{\min}(\nu_n-r+1)}\right\}^{-(\nu_n+1)} &(19)\\
&= ||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_n||^{-2(\nu_n+1)}, &(20)
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant $c_2 = \{\lambda_{\min}(\nu_n-r+1)/2\}^{(\nu_n+1)}$. The bound (19) applies for y outside the compact set $C = \{\boldsymbol{y} : \|\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_n\|^2 \leq \lambda_{\min}(\nu_n-r+1)\}$.

Taking the ratio of (18) and (20), we have that for $\boldsymbol{y} \notin \mathbb{C}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
L^2_{n+\ell,n}(\boldsymbol{y}) &\leq \frac{c_1||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}||^{-2(\nu_{n+\ell}+1)}}{c_2||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_n||^{-2(\nu_n+1)}}\\
&= \frac{c_1}{c_2}\cdot\frac{||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_n||^{2(\nu_n+1)}}{||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}||^{2(\nu_{n+\ell}+1)}}\\
&= \frac{c_1}{c_2}\cdot\frac{||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}+\mu_{n+\ell}-\mu_n||^{2(\nu_n+1)}}{||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}||^{2(\nu_{n+\ell}+1)}}\\
&\leq \frac{c_1}{c_2}\cdot\frac{(||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}||+||\mu_{n+\ell}-\mu_n||)^{2(\nu_n+1)}}{||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}||^{2(\nu_{n+\ell}+1)}}\\
&\leq \frac{c_1}{c_2}\cdot 2^{2\nu_n+1}\frac{||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}||^{2(\nu_n+1)}+||\mu_{n+\ell}-\mu_n||^{2(\nu_n+1)}}{||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}||^{2(\nu_{n+\ell}+1)}}\\
&\leq \frac{c_1}{c_2}\cdot 2^{2\nu_n+1}\left\{||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}||^{2(\nu_n-\nu_{n+\ell})}+\frac{||\mu_{n+\ell}-\mu_n||^{2(\nu_n+1)}}{||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}||^{2(\nu_{n+\ell}+1)}}\right\}. &(21)
\end{aligned}$$

The second to last step uses Jensen's inequality $f((a+b)/2) \leq (f(a)+f(b))/2$ on the convex function $f(x) = x^{2(\nu_n+1)}$ where $x > 0$ and $\nu_n > 0$.

Finally, for the bracketed term in (21), we enlarge the "exclusion compact set" C if necessary so that $||\boldsymbol{y}-\mu_{n+\ell}||^2 \geq 1$ for $y \notin C$ and then the first term is at most 1 since $\nu_n < \nu_{n+\ell}$, and the second term is at most $||\mu_{n+\ell}-\mu_n||^{2(\nu_n+1)}$. Thus the term is bounded above for any fixed n.

Appendix C: Proof of Proposition 1

When $r=1$, the density of $f|\mathscr{A}_n$ is $\phi_n \sim N(\mu_n, \sigma_n^2)$. Denote the true sampling variance as γ^2, and the precision $\gamma^{-2}=\lambda$. According to equation (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{n+1}^{-2} &= \sigma_n^{-2}+\lambda = \sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda,\\ \sigma_n^{-2} &= \sigma_0^{-2}+n\lambda,\\ \mu_{n+1} &= \sigma_{n+1}^2(\sigma_n^{-2}\mu_n+\lambda\bar{z}),\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{z}\sim N(\mu,\gamma^2)$ for some constant μ. Then for any $y\in\mathbb{R}$, $\ln L_{n+1,n}(y)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}&\ln\left(\frac{\phi_{n+1}(y)}{\phi_n(y)}\right)\\ &= \ln\left(\frac{\sigma_n}{\sigma_{n+1}}\right)-\frac{(y-\mu_{n+1})^2}{2\sigma_{n+1}^2}+\frac{(y-\mu_n)^2}{2\sigma_n^2}\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\ln\left(\frac{\sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda}{\sigma_0^{-2}+n\lambda}\right)-\frac{1}{2}(y-\mu_{n+1})^2(\sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda)+\frac{1}{2}(y-\mu_n)^2(\sigma_0^{-2}+n\lambda)\\ &= q_n+\frac{1}{2}\left[(y-\mu_n)^2(\sigma_0^{-2}+n\lambda)-(y-\mu_n+\mu_n-\mu_{n+1})^2(\sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda)\right]\\ &= q_n+\frac{1}{2}\left[-\lambda(y-\mu_n)^2-2(\mu_n-\mu_{n+1})(\sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda)(y-\mu_n)+(\mu_n-\mu_{n+1})^2(\sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda)\right]\\ &= q_n-\frac{\lambda}{2}\left\{y-\mu_n+\frac{1}{\lambda}\left[(\mu_n-\mu_{n+1})(\sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda)\right]\right\}^2\\ &\quad-\frac{1}{2}(\mu_n-\mu_{n+1})^2\left[(\sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda)-\frac{1}{\lambda}(\sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda)^2\right],\end{aligned}$$

where $q_n=\frac{1}{2}\ln\left(\frac{\sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda}{\sigma_0^{-2}+n\lambda}\right)$ is a constant. Maximizing over y gives

$$\begin{aligned}\ln C_n &= \sup_y \ln\left(\frac{\phi_{n+1}(y)}{\phi_n(y)}\right)\\ &= q_n-\frac{1}{2}(\mu_n-\mu_{n+1})^2\left[(\sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda)-\frac{1}{\lambda}(\sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda)^2\right]\\ &= q_n-\frac{1}{2}(\mu_n-\mu_{n+1})^2\left[\sigma_{n+1}^{-2}-\frac{1}{\lambda}(\sigma_{n+1}^{-2})^2\right].\end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_n-\mu_{n+1} &= \mu_n-\sigma_{n+1}^2(\sigma_n^{-2}\mu_n+\lambda\bar{z})\\ &= (1-\frac{\sigma_{n+1}^2}{\sigma_n^2})\mu_n-\sigma_{n+1}^2\lambda\bar{z}\\ &= \mu_n\left(1-\frac{\sigma_0^{-2}+n\lambda}{\sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda}\right)-\sigma_{n+1}^2\lambda\bar{z}\\ &= \mu_n\frac{\lambda}{\sigma_0^{-2}+(n+1)\lambda}-\sigma_{n+1}^2\lambda\bar{z}\\ &= \mu_n\frac{\lambda}{\sigma_{n+1}^{-2}}-\sigma_{n+1}^2\lambda\bar{z}\\ &= \lambda\sigma_{n+1}^2(\mu_n-\bar{z}),\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{z}$ is the average over the samples used to update the posterior. We have been using just one sample for the update, so $\bar{z}\sim N(\mu,\sigma^2)$, where σ^2 is the sampling variance.

Substituting, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\ln C_n &= q_n - \frac{1}{2}(\mu_n - \mu_{n+1})^2 \left[\sigma_{n+1}^{-2} - \frac{1}{\lambda}(\sigma_{n+1}^{-2})^2\right] \\ &= q_n - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2\sigma_{n+1}^4(\mu_n - \bar{z})^2 \left[\sigma_{n+1}^{-2} - \frac{1}{\lambda}(\sigma_{n+1}^{-2})^2\right] \\ &= q_n - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2(\mu_n - \bar{z})^2 \left[\sigma_{n+1}^{2} - \frac{1}{\lambda}\right] \\ &= q_n - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2(\mu_n - \bar{z})^2 \left[\frac{1}{\sigma_n^{-2} + \lambda} - \frac{1}{\lambda}\right].\end{aligned}$$

Here $\mu_n - \bar{z} = \mu_n - (\mu - \sigma N) = \sigma N + \mu_n - \mu$, where N is a standard normal random variable, so $(\mu_n - \bar{z})^2 = \sigma^2(N + (\mu_n - \mu)/\sigma)^2$. Thus conditional on $\mathscr{A}_n$,

$$\begin{aligned}\ln C_n &= q_n - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2\sigma^2(N + (\mu_n - \mu)/\sigma)^2 \left[\frac{1}{\sigma_n^{-2} + \lambda} - \frac{1}{\lambda}\right] \\ &\sim \frac{1}{2}\left(N + \frac{\mu_n - \mu}{\sigma}\right)^2,\end{aligned}$$

since $\lambda = \sigma^{-2}$ and $q_n \sim 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Here N is a standard normal random variable, so $\ln C_n$ is distributed as a non-central chi-square with 1 degree of freedom and non-central parameter $(\mu_n - \mu)^2/\sigma^2$; see, e.g., Glasserman (2004, p. 123).

Appendix D: Characterizing Strictly Convex Vectors

Here we show that the interior of $\mathbb{C}$, denoted $\mathbb{C}^\circ$, is the set of all strictly convex vectors, where $\mathbb{C}$ is defined in Definition 2. We repeatedly exploit the fact that $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{C}$ if and only if the linear system (LS) is feasible. Throughout this section we take the points $\{\boldsymbol{x}_i : 1 \le i \le r\}$ as fixed. Denote the set of indices of the design points as $\mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$. For each fixed $k \in \mathcal{I}$, consider the set $\mathcal{T}_k$ of real-valued coefficients that express $\boldsymbol{x}_k$ as a convex combination of the other points, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{T}_k = \{t \in \mathbb{R}^r : t_k = 0, t_i \in [0,1]\ i \ne k, \sum_i t_i = 1, \sum_{i=1}^r t_i \boldsymbol{x}_i = \boldsymbol{x}_k\}.$$

LEMMA 1. *Given a function g, suppose that for each $k \in \mathcal{I}$, $\sum_{i=1}^r t_i g(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - g(\boldsymbol{x}_k) > 0$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}_k$. Then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^r t_i g(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - g(\boldsymbol{x}_k) \ge \epsilon > 0$ for all k and all $t \in \mathcal{T}_k$.*

Proof. Since there are only finitely many choices for $\boldsymbol{x}_k$, we just need to show that such a bound exists for each $k \in \mathcal{I}$. So fix $k \in \mathcal{I}$. If $\mathcal{T}_k$ is a finite set, then the required bound exists by taking the minimum over a finite number of positive terms. So suppose $\mathcal{T}_k$ contains an infinite number of terms, as arises for example when multiple $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ are linearly dependent. If a positive ϵ as stated does not exist, then there is a sequence $\{t^{(n)}, n \ge 1\}$ contained in $\mathcal{T}_k$ such that $D(n) := \sum_{i=1}^r t_i^{(n)} g(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - g(\boldsymbol{x}_k) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. The set $\mathcal{T}_k$ is compact, so by passing to a subsequence we can assume that $t^{(n)} \to t^* \in \mathcal{T}_k$ as $n \to \infty$. Also since $D(n) \to 0$, it follows by continuity that $D^* = \sum_{i=1}^r t_i^* g(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - g(\boldsymbol{x}_k) = \lim_{n\to\infty} D(n) = 0$, which contradicts the assumption of the lemma.

PROPOSITION 2. *An r-dimensional vector $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{C}^\circ$ if and only if there exists a strictly convex function g whose values on $\boldsymbol{x}$ coincide with those of $\boldsymbol{g}$, i.e. $g(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{g}$ for $\boldsymbol{x} = (\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_r)$.*

Proof. First, suppose there exists a strictly convex function g with $g(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{g}$. We want to show $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{C}^\circ$. Since g is strictly convex, the strict inequalities in the statement of Lemma 1 hold for all $k \in \mathcal{I}$ and all $t \in \mathcal{T}_k$. Lemma 1 then implies that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} t_i g(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \geq g(\boldsymbol{x}_k) + \epsilon \tag{22}$$

for all k and all $t \in \mathcal{T}_k$. Consider the ball in $\mathbb{R}^r$ defined by $(\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^r : |\boldsymbol{y}_i| \leq \epsilon/2 \ \forall i)$, and the perturbed vector $\tilde{g} = \boldsymbol{g} + \boldsymbol{y}$ with ith component $g(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \boldsymbol{y}_i$. Then for any $k \in \mathcal{I}$ and any $t \in \mathcal{T}_k$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r} t_i \tilde{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right) - \tilde{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_k) &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r} t_i (g(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \boldsymbol{y}_i)\right) - (g(\boldsymbol{x}_k) + \boldsymbol{y}_k) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{r} t_i g(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - g(\boldsymbol{x}_k) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r} t_i \boldsymbol{y}_i\right) - \boldsymbol{y}_k \\
&\geq \epsilon - \max_{i=1}^{r} |\boldsymbol{y}_i| - |\boldsymbol{y}_k| \\
&\geq \epsilon - \epsilon/2 - \epsilon/2 = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus all perturbed function values in the ball centered at $\boldsymbol{g}$ are convex, and it follows that $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{C}^\circ$.

Now suppose that $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{C}^\circ$. We want to show that there exists a strictly convex function, g^* say, that coincides with $\boldsymbol{g}$ on $\boldsymbol{x}$. Since $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{C}$ there exists a convex function g that coincides with $\boldsymbol{g}$ on $\boldsymbol{x}$. Let h be an arbitrary finite-valued strictly convex function, e.g., $h(x) = \|x\|_2^2$, and let $\boldsymbol{h}$ be the restriction of h to $\boldsymbol{x}$. For $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, $\boldsymbol{g} - \delta\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathbb{C}$, since $g \in \mathbb{C}^\circ$ and $\delta\boldsymbol{h}$ is a finite vector with arbitrarily small norm for δ sufficiently small. Thus, there exists a convex function f that coincides with $\boldsymbol{g} - \delta\boldsymbol{h}$ on $\boldsymbol{x}$. But then $g^* = f + \delta h$ coincides with $\boldsymbol{g}$ on $\boldsymbol{x}$, and is the sum of a convex and strictly convex function so is strictly convex.

Appendix E: Alternatives to the Posterior Updates

When the covariance matrix Γ is known,the normal-normal conjugate prior (posterior) updates in (1) involve inverting the posterior covariance matrix Λ_n in every iteration. An alternative method is to use the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_n &= \mu_{n-1} + \Lambda_{n-1} s\Gamma^{-1}(I + \Lambda_{n-1} s\Gamma^{-1})^{-1}(\bar{y} - \mu_{n-1}) \\
\Lambda_n &= \Lambda_{n-1} - \Lambda_{n-1} s\Gamma^{-1}(I + \Lambda_{n-1} s\Gamma^{-1})^{-1}\Lambda_{n-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

In this version, only the inverse of $(I + \Lambda_{n-1} s\Gamma^{-1})$ needs to be updated in each iteration, and the inverse of Λ_{n-1} is not required. However, since Γ is full rank, this update is a full rank update on Λ_n, which means the calculation still requires $O(r^3)$ math operations.

Another way to avoid repeated matrix inversions is to update the precision matrix Λ_n^{-1} from iteration n to $n+1$ instead of the covariance matrix, and to use the Cholesky factorization when performing the updates. In each iteration, the update formula is

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_n^{-1} &= \Lambda_{n-1}^{-1} + s\Gamma^{-1} \\
L_n &= \text{Chol}(\Lambda_n^{-1}) \\
\mu_n &= \Lambda_n(\Lambda_{n-1}^{-1}\mu_{n-1} + s\Gamma^{-1}\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}) \\
&= L_n^T \backslash [L_n \backslash (\Lambda_{n-1}^{-1}\mu_{n-1} + s\Gamma^{-1}\bar{\boldsymbol{y}})].
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Here $\text{Chol}(\Lambda_n^{-1})$ is the lower-triangular Cholesky factor of Λ_n^{-1}, which is unique when Γ_n^{-1} positive definite, and $x = A\backslash b$ means to solve the linear system $Ax = b$. In Algorithm 2, when samples with distribution $N(\mu_n, \Lambda_n)$ are required, we can generate them by computing $\mu_n + L_n^T\backslash \boldsymbol{Z}$, where $\boldsymbol{Z} \sim N(\boldsymbol{0}, I)$. This is based on the fact that $\text{Chol}(\Lambda_n) = L_n^{-T}$. We are not able to find a way to directly update the Cholesky factor, so the Cholesky decomposition step is required in each iteration, which means that this method also has $O(r^3)$ complexity at each iteration.

Although these proposals do not reduce the computational complexity of the update, they allow us to do fewer matrix inversions, which makes them numerically more robust.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by National Science Foundation grants CMMI-1200315 and CMMI-1537394, and Army Research Office grant W911NF-17-1-0094.

References

Abrevaya, Jason, Wei Jiang. 2005. A nonparametric approach to measuring and testing curvature. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **23** 1–19.

Allon, Gad, Michael Beenstock, Steven Hackman, Ury Passy, Alexander Shapiro. 2007. Nonparametric estimation of concave production technologies by entropic methods. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **22** 795–816. doi:10.1002/jae.918.

Atlason, J. M. A. Epelman, S. G. Henderson. 2004. Call center staffing with simulation and cutting plane methods. *Annals of Operations Research* **127** 333–358.

Baraud, Y., S. Huet, B. Laurent. 2005. Testing convex hypotheses on the mean of a Gaussian vector. Application to testing qualitative hypotheses on a regression function. *The Annals of Statistics* **33** 214–257.

Bernardo, José M., Adrian F. M. Smith. 2008. *Bayesian Theory*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 240–376. doi: 10.1002/9780470316870.ch5.

Chen, X., B. E. Ankenman, B. L. Nelson. 2012. The effects of common random numbers on stochastic kriging metamodels. *ACM TOMACS* **22** Article 7.

DeGroot, Morris H. 1970. *Optimal Statistical Decisions*. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Diack, C. A. T., C. Thomas-Agnan. 1998. A nonparametric test of the non-convexity of regression. *Nonparametric Statistics* **9** 335–362.

Feng, Mingbin, Jeremy Staum. 2015. Green simulation designs for repeated experiments. *Proceedings of the 2015 Winter Simulation Conference*. WSC '15, IEEE Press, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 403–413.

Gelman, Andrew, John B. Carlin, Hal S. Stern, Donald B. Rubin. 2003. *Bayesian Data Analysis*. 2nd ed. Chapman & Hall/CRC Texts in Statistical Science, Chapman and Hall/CRC.

Glasserman, Paul. 2004. *Monte Carlo methods in financial engineering*. Springer, New York.

Glynn, Peter W., Gerd Infanger. 2013. Simulation-based confidence bounds for two-stage stochastic programs. *Mathematical Programming* **138** 15–42. doi:10.1007/s10107-012-0621-0.

Glynn, Peter W., Ward Whitt. 1992. The asymptotic efficiency of simulation estimators. *Oper. Res.* **40** 505–520. doi:10.1287/opre.40.3.505.

Golub, Gene H., Charles F. Van Loan. 1996. *Matrix Computations*. 3rd ed. Johns Hopkins Studies in Mathematical Sciences, The Johns Hopkins University Press..

Grant, Michael, Stephen Boyd. 2008. Graph implementations for nonsmooth convex programs. V. Blondel, S. Boyd, H. Kimura, eds., *Recent Advances in Learning and Control*. Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences, Springer-Verlag Limited, 95–110.

Grant, Michael, Stephen Boyd. 2014. CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.1. `http://cvxr.com/cvx`.

Gurobi Optimization, Inc. 2016. Gurobi optimizer reference manual. URL `http://www.gurobi.com`.

Hannah, L. A., D. B. Dunson. 2011. Multivariate Convex Regression with Adaptive Partitioning. *ArXiv e-prints* .

Jian, N. 2017. Matlab package for convexity detection. Created Dec. 22, 2016. `https://github.com/njian/convexity`.

Jian, N., S. G. Henderson, S. R. Hunter. 2014. Sequential detection of convexity from noisy function evaluations. A. Tolk, S. D. Diallo, I. O. Ryzhov, L. Yilmaz, S. Buckley, J. A. Miller, eds., *Proceedings of the 2014 Winter Simulation Conference*. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc., Piscataway, NJ, 3892–3903. doi:10.1109/WSC.2014.7020215.

Judge, G. G., T. Takayama. 1966. Inequality restrictions in regression analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **61** pp. 166–181.

Juditsky, A., A. Nemirovski. 2002. On nonparametric tests of positivity/monotonicity/convexity. *The Annals of Statistics* **30** 498–527.

Lau, Lawrence J. 1978. Testing and imposing monoticity, convexity, and quasi-convexity constraints. M. Fuss, D. McFadden, eds., *In Production Economics: A Dual Approach to Theory and Applications*. North- Holland: Amsterdam, 409–453.

Lim, Eunji, Peter W. Glynn. 2012. Consistency of multidimensional convex regression. *Operations Research* **60** 196–208.

Mathworks. 2016. Documentation for linprog. Accessed Feb. 17, 2017. `https://www.mathworks.com/help/optim/ug/linprog.html`.

Meyer, Mary C. 2012. Constrained penalized splines. *Canadian Journal of Statistics* **40** 190–206. doi:10.1002/cjs.10137.

Murty, K. G. 1988. *Linear Complementarity, Linear and Nonlinear Programming*. Heldermann Verlag, Berlin.

Nesterov, Yurii. 2004. *Introductory Lectures on Convex Optimization: A Basic Course*. Kluwer Academic.

Pasupathy, Raghu, Shane G. Henderson. 2007. Ambulance bases. Accessed May. 15, 2014. `http://simopt.org/wiki/index.php?title=Ambulances_in_a_square`.

Rasmussen, Carl Edward, Christopher K. I. Williams. 2005. *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning (Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning)*. The MIT Press.

Rubinstein, R. Y., A. Shapiro. 1990. Optimization of static simulation models by the score function method. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation* **32** 373–392.

Seijo, E., B. Sen. 2010. Nonparametric Least Squares Estimation of a Multivariate Convex Regression Function. *ArXiv e-prints* .

Silvapulle, Mervyn J., Pranab K. Sen. 2001. *Constrained Statistical Inference: Order, Inequality, and Shape Restrictions*, chap. 3. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 59–141. doi:10.1002/9781118165614.ch3.

Szechtman, Roberto, Enver Yücesan. 2016. A Bayesian approach to feasibility determination. *Proceedings of the 2016 Winter Simulation Conference*. WSC '16, IEEE Press, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 782–790.

Vogel, S. 1988. Stability results for stochastic programming problems. *Optimization* **19** 269–288.

Wang, Jianqiang C., Mary C. Meyer. 2011. Testing the monotonicity or convexity of a function using regression splines. *Canadian Journal of Statistics* **39** 89–107. doi:10.1002/cjs.10094.

Williams, D. 1991. *Probability with Martingales*. Cambridge mathematical textbooks, Cambridge University Press.